1	D. James Pak (SBN 194331)	
2	Baker & McKenzie LLP	
	12544 High Bluff Drive, Third Floor San Diego, CA 92130-3051	
3	Telephone: +1 858 523 6200	
4	Facsimile: +1 858 259 8290 D.James.Pak@bakermckenzie.com	
5	D.James. ake bakermekenzie.com	
6	Daniel J. O'Connor (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) Edward K. Runyan (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
7	Daniel A. Tallitsch (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
	BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP	
8	One Prudential Plaza 130 East Randolph Drive	
9	Chicago, IL 60601	
10	Telephone: +1 312 861 8000 daniel.oconnor@bakermckenzie.com	
11	edward.runyan@bakermckenzie.com	
	daniel.tallitsch@bakermckenzie.com	
12		
13	Attorneys for Defendant	
14	Nintendo of America Inc.	
15		DIGEDICE COUNT
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	OAKLAND DIVISION	
18	OLYMPIC DEVELOPMENTS AG, LLC,	Case No. 4:11-cv-00329-SBA
19	Plaintiff,	
20	,	INDOROGEDI ODDED DENVING
21	V.	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
22	NINTENDO OF AMERICA INC.,	CONSIDER WHETHER CASE SHOULD BE RELATED
	Defendants.	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
۷۵	IDBODOSEDI OBDED DENIVINO ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO	
	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO	

CASE NO. 4:11-CV-00329-SBA

Case 4:11-cv-00329-SBA Document 77 Filed 04/20/11 Page 2 of 2

17

21

23

22

24

26

25

27

28

On April 7, 2011, Plaintiff Olympic Developments AG, LLC ("Olympic") filed an Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Case Should Be Related. Specifically, Olympic requests that this Court consider whether the instant case should be related to Olympic Developments AG, LLC v. Sony Computer Entertainment of America, Case No. 3:11-cv-01080-JCS. Defendant Nintendo of America Inc. ("NOA") filed an Opposition to Olympic's Motion on April 11, 2011.

Having reviewed Olympic's Motion, NOA's Opposition, the files and records of this Court, the Court hereby finds that the two cases involve different parties and different accused products, and therefore do not concern substantially the same property, transaction or event as required by LR 3-12(a)(1). Moreover, because the defendants and accused products are different, and because the defendants are likely to have competing interests and strategies, and are entitled to present individualized assaults on questions of non-infringement, invalidity, and claim construction, conducting the cases before different judges is not likely to cause unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or potentially conflicting results.

The Court therefore DENIES Olympic's Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Case Should Be Related.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/19/11

United States Judge